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City of Thousand Oaks – City Council
Attn: Community Development Department
c/o Mr. Kelvin Parker
2100 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: Application for Letter of Public Necessity & Convenience
Oak & Iron
2967 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Dear Honorable Councilmembers:

On your consent calendar for this evening is the above listed item that has my full support as a resident of this city. The Thousand Oaks Blvd. Specific Plan calls for businesses such as this that will energize the area and bring new life to portions of the Blvd that have been all but dormant for the past many years.

Oak & Iron brings a fresh new upscale look and provides the type of gathering space called for in the plan and encouraged by Council and the community. The unique blending of craft cocktails will no doubt draw interested parties from surrounding communities in addition to or own residents.

The opportunity is yours to deliver on a promise that supports and encourages businesses such as Oak & Iron to invest in our city. Business opportunities such as this will no doubt be part of the transformation that creates the spaces we are looking for while providing the economic development that will stimulate our local economy.

I strongly encourage the approval of this item.

Respectfully,

Joel R. Price
872 Capitan St.
Newbury Park, CA 91320
Good morning!

I was reading in the latest issue of the Acorn the article, "Council to get first look at new housing proposal" in regards to developing the empty lot behind Albertsons at Reino Road and Maurice Drive.

I am writing to express my enthusiasm about developing the lot.

My husband and I live in Newbury Park, near the proposed development site. We shop at Albertson’s weekly, and regularly visit the CVS, Chase bank and dry cleaners in that same shopping center.

This is our neighborhood, which we love, in part because of the beautiful Albertson’s shopping center.

I remember, years ago, driving along Reino Road before the Albertson’s was built. When the shopping center went in, I was thrilled. It’s beautiful, convenient and sensitively constructed around the creek that runs along Reino Road.

In my opinion, it’s one of the prettiest stretches of road in the Conejo Valley.

As for the empty lot now up for consideration, it appears simply as that: an empty lot. Barren and surrounded by a chain-link fence, it begs for development (as do a few other lots in town, like the one next to Kohl’s).

So when I hear that a proposal is being considered, my first instinct is to say “hooray!” When I saw the artist’s rendering of the apartment-townhouse development proposed for the site, my initial reaction was confirmed. It looks beautiful, and I would welcome it in our neighborhood.

As the article indicates, the site is a long way from actual development, as this is merely the first stage of a long process. But I am excited about the prospect of developing this empty, fallow lot—unsightly and usable to no one—as soon as possible. I look forward to seeing its progress.

My only concern, at this junction, is the feel and size of Reino Road. I love that it’s a pretty little road, not a huge boulevard, that meanders between Potrero Road and Pepper Tree Park. I would hate to see the character of the road changed too much in order to accommodate a development. Widening the road, for instance, would make me pause.

But, again, at this initial phase, I am thrilled about the idea of developing the lot with attractive housing.

Thank you for considering my viewpoint, and for all the work you do to keep Thousand Oaks safe and beautiful.

Kind regards,
Allyson Gray
Newbury Park
Hello T.O. Council members.

I hope you’re all doing well. Let me start by thanking you for your service to our community. I’m sure that much of the correspondence you receive are complaints, and I wanted to make sure you all know that regardless of how I might feel about your decisions on any particular matter, I appreciate your service to our community. You don’t have an easy job.

I’m emailing you regarding my concerns about a recent article I read in the TO Acorn regarding the proposed multifamily development on Reino Rd, behind the Albertsons shopping center, that is up for review by the council. Being a resident of Newbury Park since 1970, as well as a realtor for the last 17 years, I am very familiar with the traffic patterns and housing density for that area. Personally, I am all for adding additional housing to the area and don’t have an issue with the proposal of adding new living units. My concern has to do with the proposal of the building being 3 stories. In my opinion, that type of development does not fit in with the general plan of the area. Not only would it astatically be out of place with its surroundings, but it would most definitely create additional traffic congestion in an area that already has a narrow corridor between Lynn Rd and Borchard Rd.

That area is unable to safely support the amount of additional traffic that would ensue should a multi-level living area be built there. My hope is that the council will consider amending the current proposal to only 2 levels. I believe this would allow the additional people to assimilate more easily, and safely, into the surrounding community.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Craig Burritt
Newbury Park resident
From: Shirin Grossman <shirin.grossman@gmail.com>
Date: February 26, 2019 at 13:03:49 PST
To: "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>
Subject: Citizen Feedback on Proposed Residential Project at 3801 Maurice Drive

Dear Councilmember Bill-de la Pena,

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed residential project at 3801 Maurice Drive that is the topic for allocation approval in tonight’s City Council meeting at 6:00 pm. I was hoping to attend the City Council meeting in person to express my feedback, but am currently ill with a bad cold and don’t wish to expose others.

I am a resident of the Brighten Lane community that is located across from the proposed site at Maurice Drive. While I fully recognize that there is a state-wide push to increase housing options in California, I ask that the City strongly reconsider the impact of allowing a high-density development to this parcel. The T-intersection of Maurice Drive and Reino Road currently is a high-traffic area for which the current traffic management of a single stop sign on Maurice Drive is insufficient. Drivers on Maurice Drive seeking to turn onto Reino often have to drive past the cross-walk line in order to view oncoming traffic from Reino. Drivers on Reino Road are often driving at an accelerated speed between the street lights at Kimber Road and Lynn Road, especially those coming from Lynn Road with the downhill slope and curved direction of Reino Road.

The introduction of additional housing, and therefore, cars, will only increase vehicle traffic at the Maurice-Reino intersection. The introduction of 47 units suggests an increase of almost 100 cars, if every unit has two cars, and not including any guest cars. Thus, I disagree with the response to Question 3 under Section (d) Community Benefits that no additional off-site improvements need to occur. I believe that the City needs to consider the need to introduce additional traffic lights and cross-walks to better manage the traffic and safety of the pedestrians, and especially so if new housing is to be added to the area.

I recognize that the discussion at today’s meeting is to only grant an allocation of residential capacity and that this is not the full proposal. That said, I would ask that that the City Council consider:

• Reducing the density allotment from the high density requested to the medium density of the surrounding residential areas to reduce the burden of additional vehicles in the area
• Revisiting the current traffic management at Maurice Drive and Reino Road from its current single stop sign to a traffic light scenario similar to that at Reino Road and Newbury Park Place.

Respectfully,
Shirin Grossman
Dear Ed and Bob,

Based upon the information that Kyle Jorrey turned up after Kohan’s approval, my family and I strongly support Claudia’s decision to reconsider his approval to the Planning Commission. We hope you agree to support and change your vote to NO.

It’s about time we as a community start really analyzing why people have such little faith in government. One of the reasons, is the public perception is quite often negative towards “City Hall” is that “they” are all too chummy with these developers. Putting someone on the PC who has open cases coming before that same commission is definitively a conflict of interest.

Please do not put the city development process into such jeopardy as to create a conflict of interest with the Kohan appointment.

Thank you
Sally, Ken and Megan Hibbitts
3119 W. Adirondack
Westlake 91362

Sent from my iPhone
Dear City Council Members and Staff,

Despite Mr. Adam’s protests reported in the Acorn, I believe the entire City Council should reconsider the wisdom of appointing a proven champion for development to our Planning Commission. It seems to me that anyone who actually has a development project already coming before the Planning Commission and City Council (even though he will recuse himself from that one hearing) waves a big, red flag.

Our Planning Commission needs to weigh the pros and cons of each application in a fair-minded and unbiased manner. Supporting and appointing someone whose livelihood is pushing through development projects is completely inappropriate and does not serve the best interests of Thousand Oaks residents.

Thank you for consideration of my concerns.

~Janet Miller Wall
former T.O. Planning Commissioner and
Member of Conejo Oak Tree Advocates